

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2877

Later, a group of about 100 Cubans, most of them members of invasion brigade 2506, set out on a protest march to police headquarters.

The citizenry of Miami, Fla., has long borne with patience the burden of an onslaught of dispossessed Cubans—a burden which should long ago have been shared by the entire United States.

Valiant efforts have been made by our President, the Federal and State agencies, our churches, business institutions, and individual citizens, to assist in every way possible.

Arriving in Miami penniless and with just the clothes they were wearing, almost all of these Cuban refugees had been forced to give up their homes, their businesses, their life savings, and all their personal property.

To help them meet the basic needs of existence, the Federal Government has made financial and other assistance available to them until they can become self-supporting.

Employment opportunity in Miami is limited. There simply are not enough jobs to accommodate both local residents and refugees. There arose open competition and economic conflict between the permanent citizenry and the incoming refugees. The balloon had to burst.

I have noted the ever-increasing frustrations, stresses, strains, and economic ills imposed on the people of my area. For this reason, I have for over 2 years fought for a more realistic approach to this long-festering situation.

I have repeatedly advocated—to two Presidents and Government officials—that Dade County and Florida had reached a saturation point on the acceptance of Cuban refugees.

Long ago I urged, and have continued fighting for, the establishment of an additional port of entry and reception center.

Long ago, and many times since, I urged extension and amplification of the resettlement program under which the Government—through January 25, 1963—has resettled 53,974 Cubans, not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons entering and registering from Cuba. Again I reiterate, no community the size of metropolitan Dade County could conceivably be expected to absorb such a shock.

Time and time again, I have met with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other top echelon governmental officials concerned with the Cuban refugee programs, to discuss the need to reevaluate the overall program. Long ago, it was obvious that this was no longer a temporary situation; the facts demanded that priority attention be devoted to resettlement—to opening a reception center elsewhere.

Admirable efforts have been made by this administration and the agencies of the Federal Government in their attempts to alleviate this situation. While the programs instituted have been highly successful, we have to do more.

On February 5 of this year, I addressed myself to reports that a so-called

Cuban GI bill was being considered. At that time, I publicly stated my opposition before top echelon officials of executive agencies having jurisdiction of the Cuban refugee program. I told all that I felt that the present programs are more than adequate and that I am opposed to any new or additional benefits. I am grateful that no more has been heard of this proposition.

I again respectfully submit that Cuban exiles must be allocated to communities all over the United States and not concentrated in one already greatly overburdened area, and no further flow should come to the Miami area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spread on the RECORD a letter which as recently as February 15 I directed to Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program:

I am quite concerned over the Cuban refugee program in my district. The residents of Dade County have been extremely patient and understanding of the problems of these refugees and have cooperated to the fullest. However, as I have emphasized many times before, Dade County has long ago reached the saturation point.

I have been deluged with mail from my constituents indicating their dissatisfaction with the rate of resettlement of these refugees (the latest official figures indicate a severe drop in resettlements) and their strong opposition to any additional benefits to the Cuban refugees. I am in full agreement with these views, and I might add that I believe the present programs to be more than adequate and I am opposed to the establishment of broad new programs for any Cuban refugees. I fully support the previously granted authorization for qualified Cuban refugees to serve and be trained in the U.S. Armed Forces, but not to be granted any special benefits or privileges for this service.

I would respectfully request, first, that if any additional Cuban refugees are to be permitted to enter the United States in the future, they be assigned to a port of entry and processed through a reception center other than Dade County or the State of Florida; second, that additional emphasis be placed on the resettlement program and that it be accelerated and implemented to the fullest degree; and third, that I be notified at the earliest practicable moment if any new programs or broadening of present programs are being contemplated.

I respectfully go on record, Mr. Speaker, urging the immediate attention of the House to this most urgent request. The situation in the Miami area is dangerous and explosive. It is made for those who would deliberately attempt to set citizen against refugee—yes, even refugee against refugee—and to utilize the pent-up emotions of American and Cuban alike to supply the fuel of the Communist propagandist.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to act on some conclusive solution for this problem which will relieve all possibilities of a further attempt to exploit the frustrations and stresses of residents of the Miami area. The need is not tomorrow, but right now.

It is imperative that action be taken to permanently alleviate the economic and psychological ills that have beset the long-suffering Miami community. We must expeditiously implement the hu-

manitarian and intelligent programs which will relocate large numbers of Cuban exiles immediately—until such day as they can be returned to a free, democratic Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise that, partially in response to my letter to Mr. Thomas, a meeting was held between officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and four national voluntary agencies which have major responsibility for carrying out the Cuban resettlement program. Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of HEW's new Welfare Administration, told the group that the resettlement program has her full support and the full support of the Department and the Federal Government. She said:

We want to secure the best possible resettlement of the refugees in the least possible time so that the fathers and mothers and children in Miami, who so urgently need new homes and new jobs, can begin new lives. In the case of the refugees, the path to independence and self-support can follow only one major route—resettlement.

It is a source of deep satisfaction to me to note that the good work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be continued—that relocation is to be immediately accelerated and diligently pursued. This is one constructive step toward the ultimate solution.

I have received the following letter from Mr. John F. Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program, in response to my February 15 letter, to which I have referred earlier in this statement, in which I called his attention to the urgency for an immediate solution of the Cuban refugee resettlement problem:

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Thank you very much for your letter of February 15. Although I have only been on the job for a few weeks I have also noted a change in the tenor of opinion with regard to the Cuban refugees. These reports have served to stimulate in my office an already existing sense of urgency to accelerate our resettlement program. To that end I have met, individually and collectively, the top ranking staff of the voluntary agencies with whom the Government holds contracts for resettlement purposes. I can assure you that we will have their full support in our drive to resettle the refugees to areas of the country other than the Miami/Dade County area.

I hope that I will have the opportunity of meeting you personally to discuss my observations on this refugee problem and to review with you my plan of approach toward resolving it as humanly and as expeditiously as possible.

In closing may I add my word of praise for the generous, warmhearted, democratic attitude of the people of Dade County toward the Cuban refugees. It will go down in history in the book that records great deeds on the part of people for persons caught in the whirlpool of persecution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. THOMAS,
Director, Cuban Refugee Program.

This is indeed encouraging information, Mr. Speaker. But again I must stress, with all the force of which I am possessed, the need is not tomorrow, but right now.

THE ROSE AS NATIONAL FLOWER

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States.

The rose is representative of the beauty that is America. Horticulturists have given us purple, silver, gold, yellow, pink, white, lavender, and orange roses along with variegated ones to add to the red rose. Roses today are of almost every hue and tint and shade, practically covering the spectrum.

Roses are well known and as well loved in Europe, China, and Japan as they are in America. They have been known and cultivated from earliest times, having been planted by the Persians in their gardens along the Tigris and Euphrates. The Hanging Gardens of Babylon reportedly contained roses. The Island of Rhodes is named after the rose, and King Midas in all his wealth cherished roses, so history relates.

There is a worldwide love of roses. They appeal to persons of all ages, all races, all countries. The rose has very often been called the "queen of flowers." It is also referred to as "everybody's flower."

Most of them can grow in almost any climate and under almost any reasonable condition. In our country, roses thrive from Alaska to Florida, and from Hawaii to Maine. No other flower in the United States begins blooming in spring and continues right up to the first hard frost. Only a few flowers when planted continue to live year after year like the rose without being replaced.

The beauty of roses is soothing on the eyes and the wafted perfume a sedative to the nerves. Roses have greater versatility than any other flower—some grow 12 inches tall and others climb 12 feet. There are roses that can be grown outdoors, others than can be grown indoors; there are roses that produce masses of color in the landscape; roses that can be planted in borders, in beds, as hedges, as fences, as screens to hide undesirable places, as ground covers, and even screens against the weather.

For centuries, roses have been used to make rose wine, rose sachet, rose water, rose perfume, attar of roses, rose honey, candied rose petals, rose soap, and so forth. All flowers are beautiful and all contribute to our enjoyment of them. But many people hold that the rose is a flower that stands alone—apart from and distinguished from all others.

The rose is known to men and women everywhere as the symbol of peace and hope, and it is recognized as the badge of courage, loyalty, and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, we are the only major nation that does not have an officially designated national flower. Nearly all of the principal countries of the world have a national flower or floral symbol, and the rose is the most frequent one chosen to honor a country. England, Iran, Turkey, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Honduras have all chosen

the rose to be identified as their national flower. Most other major countries apparently have a national flower.

Bills to adopt an official flower for our country have been introduced in Congress before. But to date no national flower has been adopted mainly because there is lack of agreement as to which flower and as to just what should constitute the requirements of a national flower. There is no question in my mind but that the rose meets every requirement. What single flower can boast of so many varied employments and enjoyments? The rose can be said to be, indeed, the queen of flowers. It can be readily understood why, and I am hopeful that this Congress will soon adopt the rose as our national flower.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. SISK), for 60 minutes, on February 27, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUDDLESTON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATHIAS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. SILER in five instances.

Mr. McLOSKEY in three instances.

Mr. McINTIRE.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

Mr. BARRY in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENZEL.

Mr. BOB WILSON in five instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. CHENOWETH.

Mr. CURTIS in four instances.

Mr. PELLY in five instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SISK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOSS in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. WAGGONER.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. LEGGETT in five instances.

Mr. POOL in four instances.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. RYAN of New York in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. PURCELL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

471. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

472. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

474. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

475. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1963 (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2875

tax cut, tied so closely to tax reform, isn't it possible that the tax reform angle might delay this to the point where the tax cut might be lost?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, and I would be opposed to that. What we suggested was a tax cut of over \$13 billion, and reforms which would bring in about \$3 billion, roughly, of revenues, giving us a total tax cut of \$10 billion. We felt that, therefore, the goal is the \$10-billion tax cut in the length of time which we have recommended.

If we cannot get the reform, then quite obviously you are going to have to rewrite the package. It might be possible to send up, or for the Congress to pass, a \$10-billion tax cut without the reform, but that would mean changes, of course, in the rate reduction structure. So it was our feeling that from the national interest, even though I realized that some taxpayers may find it more desirable to have the simple \$10-billion cut with consequent adjustments of all the rates, than they would the \$13-billion cut, with the reform, it may be that Congress will come to that conclusion.

That isn't our judgment of the best action. But I quite agree that what we need is the bill this year, and nothing should stand in its way. Our feeling is that the best bill that can be gotten will be the one we recommended. But I would say the first priority is a bill. We have to realize that if we don't get the reform, then, of course, the tax bill would have to be rewritten, unless the Congress made a judgment that it would accept a tax cut of \$13 billion.

Our concern is that they might take a tax cut of less than \$10 billion, which would be, I think, a mistake. If we are going to do this, we might as well do it right or not do it at all. But that is the choice. But to answer your question, I would say the important thing is to get the bill this year. Whatever is necessary to get that bill, I would support.

PRODUCTIVITY

Question. Mr. President, doesn't the prospective deficit, as well as the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments, make it even more important than previously to prevent wage rates from increasing faster than productivity?

THE PRESIDENT. I would think that wage rates would follow—I hope they would follow the general guidelines which have been suggested on several occasions, which are tied to the principle which you just described, that wage rates should be tied to productivity increases. The difficulty, of course, is arguing that productivity increases and also discussing how increases in productivity should be divided. But I think the general principle is one we certainly support and continue to support.

The fact of the matter is that it represents that, and the other point would be a real concentration by American corporations on the export market. We have never really given it—some companies have—the attention it deserves as a nation. But there are these markets throughout the world, and I would hope that every American corporation—that is the greatest contribution they could make.

In my earlier answer, the American businessmen benefits, as well as our security benefits from the dollar as an international mechanism. I would hope that they would concentrate as a national service as well as one that would bring them a private return, that they would concentrate their energies on developing their export market. That can make a great difference to us. If management and labor can be responsible in the next year or two, and there is a concentration on export markets, I think we have a much better chance to lick the problem.

OTHERS AFFECTED

One of the points that I think is worth making is that there are these dollars overseas which represent a call on our gold. If our economy is doing well, then I think that people will have confidence in the dollar, and that serves the whole Western community.

If we were dependent only on gold, and gold which, after all, increases by what—\$700 million a year, probably, how could you possibly finance the tremendous movements of trade which we now have in the world unless you have sterling and the dollar which gold supports? If you just use gold, we would be back to 1929, and you would have the most restrictive effect on our economy, our free flow of trade and, therefore, the defense of the Western World.

What we are really talking about is not only the national security, but if the United States does not maintain its economy in good position, then Great Britain cannot afford to take those steps to provide a stimulus to her economy at home, and in addition, those countries of Latin America, particularly, which sell their raw materials to us, would be depressed, so everything hangs upon us.

Everything hangs upon our maintaining our economy effectively and maintaining the kind of discipline which your question suggests.

Can I have one more? I know you have other speakers.

STIMULATIVE

Question. Mr. President, you have commented on the potential or possible recession and its magnitude, referring back to 1958. Would you care to comment, if your tax proposal is enacted, what the magnitude of the potential might be with regard to economic stimulation?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, I think we have talked about the three or four times stimulus which a \$10 billion tax cut would have, which would be \$30 billion, three times, 300 percent, which we would hope, and also, of course, that it would also bring a return in revenues.

That is why we feel that the combination of the stimulation on our economy of the multiplication factor of three times, and also the additional returns this would bring to Federal revenues, makes us feel that the proposed tax cut is fiscally responsible.

As I said at the beginning, if we were going to err, I would certainly err on the side of a large enough tax cut, not to go through this laborious, painful procedure which we are all going through and then bring forth a mouse. I would hope that we would bring forth one that would do the job.

Thank you very much.

A FEDERAL BANKING COMMISSION

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today, H.R. 4253, to create a Federal Banking Commission. This is a most important bill and I trust that action can be taken on it during this Congress.

The proposed Banking Commission would gather together in one agency all of the bank supervisory and insurance powers presently exercised by the Federal Government. The experience of the past 30 years has shown that the multiplicity

of Federal banking supervisory agencies has resulted in conflict, duplication, and in a general vagueness about which agency does what.

Under this bill the FBC will take over the functions and powers of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency; it will assume jurisdiction over charters, branches, mergers, holding companies, and fiduciary and foreign banking operations. It will relieve the Federal Reserve Board of the administrative functions it now has and allow the Board to devote its time to its primary function, monetary policy.

I would like to point out that the bill makes no substantive changes in the law and does not add any new powers; that is, it does not increase the Federal Government's regulatory power, only its efficiency.

If, during the course of hearings on this bill, it is thought that substantive changes in the law must be made, then this should be done with separate legislation.

H.R. 4253 is necessary for the effective and efficient regulation of our banking system. The Government owes the banking community the best possible service and it owes the public the best possible protection that the regulatory function of the Federal Government can provide.

This bill will strengthen the dual banking system.

It is my opinion that this bill, together with my bill, H.R. 729, should be set for hearing at the same time. If the Congress agrees with the principle set forth in my bill, H.R. 729, then we will combine in one agency all of the insuring functions of the Federal Government and then add a separate banking commission which will devote itself to all banking functions other than insurance. Obviously, if the latter principle prevails, H.R. 4253 will be amended accordingly.

OMINOUS OUTBURST BY CUBAN REFUGEES IN MIAMI EXPOSES DANGEROUS MOUNTING TENSIONS

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. SISK) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again draw the attention of the House to the ominous outburst by Cuban refugees in Miami last Thursday—February 21—during which exiled Cubans engaged in street rioting accompanied by threats and imprecations against local police authority and the American way of life.

So dangerous was this situation, so disruptive of the usual quiet life of a peaceful community, that it was headlined in the responsible Miami News of that date in these words: "350 Howling Cuban Exiles Battle Police, Pickets Here—Officers Stoned—Rioters Arrested."

2876

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 26

And Milt Sosin, reporter of the Miami News, placed the tragic and ugly incident before the public in his following news story, part of which I shall now read:

A howling, rock-throwing mob of more than 350 Cuban exiles battled with Miami police today in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in protest against picketing by four members of a nationwide pacifist organization.

The rioting, which lasted about 30 minutes, attracted several hundred spectators to the scene at 17th Street and Biscayne Boulevard and resulted in the arrest of 13 Cubans on charges of disorderly conduct and breach of the peace.

At one point the angry, screaming exiles, many of them women, hurled rocks weighing 2 to 5 pounds into the ranks of some 100 police and fire department officers who were rushed to the scene.

At the height of the brawling, police received word that friends of the arrested Cubans were threatening to storm the Miami Police Station at 1145 Northwest 11th Street.

Immediately 20 patrol cruisers surrounded the station and 25 helmeted officers, many leading police dogs, blocked entrances to the station. The mob failed to show up.

The crowd at the Revolutionary Council headquarters first became restive when Donald D. Pomerleau, city of Miami public safety director, showed up and asked the Cuban leaders to break up the demonstration.

This apparently put the exiles in an ugly mood, for they began surging toward police lines, and across the street from council headquarters a handful of exile women shouted "Fuera, Fuera" (go away) and began tossing rocks.

The situation reached its peak at 10:02 a.m. when the pickets, three youths and an elderly woman, appeared on Biscayne Boulevard walking south with placards.

The signs said, "Oppose Military Solutions," "Thou Shalt Not Kill," and "Peace Corps, Not Marine Corps, in Latin America."

The pickets turned west on 17th Street and were met headlong by the now wildly infuriated crowd. Rocks, bottles, and eggs rained down on the heads of police who were trying to force the Cubans back behind heavy ropes on private property lines.

Pomerleau and Assistant Police Chief Glenn Baron called for more reinforcements, including three pieces of fire department equipment.

A hook-and-ladder truck arrived and plugged a hose into a corner fire hydrant and stood by in readiness.

A husky 225-pound Cuban broke loose from the lines and rushed police who threw him to the ground in the median parkway strip of 17th Street.

Several times the screaming exile knocked five officers off his back, until finally he was overpowered, handcuffed, and led to a patrol wagon.

The five pickets from the Committee for Nonviolent Action were finally hustled into a patrol wagon and taken to police headquarters where they were interrogated, but not booked.

Pomerleau said the four promised they would not picket again in the city of Miami adding they planned to leave after their release by police.

Pomerleau also issued a statement saying he had warned the picketers they would be arrested if they stage any future demonstrations within the city.

Police said efforts to place Spanish-speaking officers in the crowd to calm them down had failed, and apparently only served to further enrage the exiles.

About 50 policemen remained at the scene where a handful of Cubans appeared with a sign reading, "Enemies protected by democracy kill freedom."

This was interpreted to mean the Cuban felt the arrest of their own people and the freeing of the pickets was unfair.

At one point, about 10:20 a.m., all available Miami police except those who were needed on key assignments, were at the riot.

Police were under orders not to draw guns, and relied mainly on their numbers and the threat of using nightsticks to battle back the infuriated mob.

The elderly woman who led the pacifist pickets was not identified by name but told police intelligence officers she had come here from New York to lead the demonstration.

Leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had been advised 5 days ago of the pickets' intentions of demonstrating, but apparently decided to try to keep exiles from the scene.

Several members of the Cuban Invasion Brigade 2506 were among the rioters, wearing their combat uniforms and urging the exiles on.

The Committee for Nonviolent Action has its national headquarters in New York City and is dedicated to the banning of nuclear weapons, and a halt to military conscription in this country.

The arrested Cubans are scheduled to appear in municipal court at 9 a.m., February 27.

A small crowd of spectators still were hanging around the riot scene at noon, but police had dispersed the Cubans and reopened 17th Street to vehicular traffic.

At the peak of the rioting, three men believed to be Federal agents were spotted atop a building about a block away. An investigator for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was on the scene making photographs of the mob members.

Mr. Speaker, so shaken was the Miami community by the danger signals raised by this Cuban refugee outburst that the respected Miami Herald of February 22, 1963, carried an editorial which I would like to read into the record:

NO RIGHT TO RIOT

It was an ugly business at Cuban Revolutionary Council where yesterday a group of refugees reacted violently to a group of peace pickets.

The damage was more than some bruised heads. The refugees resisted police who sought to impose order and some arrests were made.

Our Cuban guests must understand that picketing is a legal expression of free opinion in this country. We do not need violence to register dissent, which is also an inherent right.

But this in no way excuses the pickets who exercised their right in what was clearly a provocative manner. The kind of peace these pickets appear to seek is strange indeed.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the fears for the safety and the future of the Miami community which I have so often and for so long expressed are here drastically revealed as based in fact and that these disrupters of the peace and quiet of Dade County have fallen prey to those who would add fuel to the Communist propaganda line.

So ominous do I consider the present situation, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to reiterate my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21 in which I referred to the following newspaper reports from Miami:

From the Associated Press, Thursday, February 21—

At 10 a.m. this morning four pacifists carrying picket signs began to picket the

Cuban Revolutionary Council at 17th and Biscayne Boulevard, Miami. A riot began. One of the revolutionary council officials, with a loudspeaker, asked all to be calm. Thereupon, some 200 or more Cubans entered the foray with bottles, eggs, stones, and other items.

The police were called. The riot squad of police and dogs tried to break up the gathering. Six policemen were seen fighting with one Cuban in an effort to get him under control. Thirteen Cubans were picked up by the Miami police, four of whom are reportedly members of the 2506 Brigade. Fire trucks were called to the scene ready to use water hoses to disperse the crowd. Attempts by members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council to quell the violence were responded to by jeers and catcalls by their fellow Cubans. During the riot, Cubans were heard screaming:

"Even Castro does not permit this," followed by denunciatory statements to the effect that they did not like nor did they want "this kind of democracy," the kind that would let this type of people run around loose. The rioters fighting the police screamed and denounced them as "Communists."

The same day the following was carried on the wires of the United Press:

Violence erupted today when a group of pacifists attempted to picket the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Club-wielding police quickly broke up the demonstration when 200 angry Cubans clashed with the pickets. About half a dozen exiles were arrested by police, who entered the headquarters of the council, prepared for what looked like the beginning of a street riot. The police were denounced violently by the Cubans, many of them members of the Cuban Invasion brigade, who shouted, "Communists—even Castro doesn't do this in Cuba." Three firetrucks moved into a side street and prepared to douse the area with water if necessary. Police, under command of Miami Safety Director Col. Don Pomerleau, broke up the disorders within 10 minutes. Trouble started even before the arrival of the pickets when Spanish-speaking police, using a portable loudspeaker, requested the Cubans to remain inside the property limits of the council grounds.

Jose A. Hernandez, a spokesman for the council's labor organization, speaking to the Cubans through a microphone from the headquarters porch, urged them to go home peacefully and not play into the hands of the Communists who want to cause disorder here.

The exiles reacted violently against the request and denounced Hernandez and shouted epithets at him. Another council representative, Raul Mendez, then appealed over the microphone for the crowd to go home.

His petition was greeted with loud boos and angry shouts. For a few minutes, it looked like some members of the crowd were going to attack the two council representatives. At this point, the police, who originally posted about 15 men, summoned reinforcements including about 15 motorcycle officers.

A few minutes later, the pickets, men and women, apparently Americans, arrived carrying signs bearing pacifist slogans such as "War will end man or man will end war" and "We oppose military service."

The pickets massed on a grassy mall directly in front of the council headquarters entrance, and then suddenly violence erupted when one Cuban darted across the street and ripped a sign out of a picket's hands. Stones and bottles were hurled at the police by the Cuban exiles.

Police roped off the property of the council and refused to let anyone in or out.

Cuba
Still a Soviet Base**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing realization throughout the Nation that there have been many premature claims made by the administration in regard to the extent of the Soviet Union's withdrawal from Cuba. In fact, the administration's all-out efforts to minimize the extent of the Soviet Union's commitment in Cuba have served, instead, to underscore the magnitude and seriousness of the military buildup and the threat this presents to other nations in Latin America.

The Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News recently placed the Cuban situation in its proper perspective in an editorial of February 21, 1963, entitled "Still a Soviet Base." The editorial reads as follows:

STILL A SOVIET BASE

Soviet Russia apparently has indicated it will withdraw some of its estimated 17,000 troops from Cuba by mid-March, and the administration insists there has been no deal whatever in obtaining this much of a Soviet contribution to the relief of international tensions.

While we wait to learn, if we can, what the partial withdrawing amounts to, it will be well to keep minds firmly fixed on two key questions of basic Soviet intent.

1. Is Khrushchev still determined to maintain Cuba as a permanent and secure Soviet base, committing whatever force is needed to keep Castro both in power and in a puppet relationship to Russia?

2. Is he still determined to exploit the Cuban base for such mischief in this hemisphere as he can stir up—especially to use it as the stronghold from which to distribute materiel and trained manpower for a growing campaign of subversion against other Latin American governments?

If the answer to both questions is yes—as we have no reason to doubt it is—then any minor ups and downs in any given week's intelligence estimate of how many Russians are in Cuba become relatively insignificant.

Even the 17,000 figure currently in vogue here is an intelligence guess that could be off target by several or many thousand. So withdrawal of a shipload or two of Russians could still leave Cuba with as many Soviet troops as most of us think are there now. Any conspicuous withdrawal now, moreover, could be offset at any time by a gradual and covert replacement of the same numbers.

Whatever assurance it may have conveyed as to the removal of Soviet offensive missiles, the recent McNamara intelligence briefing on the continuing Soviet military presence in Cuba left no doubt that the Russians had established what was intended as a permanent base there.

The Russians, in short, give no sign whatever of being about to liquidate their Cuban base—and until they do, we will have no reason for doubting the uses to which they show every determination to put it, primarily as a secure base for the clandestine supply of materiel for rebellion against and trained experts for subversion of other Latin governments.

So let's withhold cheers for any partial withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba not only until it actually happens but until we can be sure it portends something significant.

Why the Lag in Military Space Development?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register:

WHY THE LAG IN MILITARY SPACE DEVELOPMENT?

What is holding the United States back in the development of military defenses in space?

It cannot be because there is no need for such defenses. As Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, points out in his article, if the "increasing space capabilities on the part of the U.S.S.R. are coupled with their announced objective of world domination, we have more than sufficient cause to stimulate an even more energetic space program for our national defense." Dr. I. A. Getting, president of the Aerospace Corp., said recently that "in the exploitation of space we appear to be risking unilateral disarmament."

It cannot be for lack of funds. Journal and Register Editor James J. Haggerty, Jr., reports and analyzes the vast sums being carried in the budget for all space purposes.

It cannot be for lack of interest or concern on the part of the Armed Forces nor a lack of skill and experience in the services. The articles in this issue by the Navy's Rear Adm. J. P. Monroe and the Army's Lt. Gen. Dwight E. Beach, and the comprehensive Air Force report we will publish next week from Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, reveal the deep interest and concern of these leaders in the utilization of space for the carrying out of their missions. As to experience, it must be remembered that it was the military services who initiated and developed all our early space activities and that they are still indispensable to all the Nation's space work.

The answer lies in the administration and the top management of the Department of Defense. As Space Editor Haggerty put it in last week's issue, "the military proposes, DOD disposes." Dr. Edward Teller, one of the Nation's top scientists, told a conference last autumn that the cautious approach being taken by the Defense Department and NASA will result in the United States losing more ground in its space race with the U.S.S.R.

The DOD attitude was frankly expounded by Assistant Defense Secretary John H. Rubel in October when he branded as a doctrinal abstraction the statement that weapons that will operate and the missions that will be performed in space will therefore, be extensions of those with which we are familiar.

Perhaps the weapons and missions in space will not be extensions of those with which we are familiar, but we will not know this, nor the directions they will take, until the military is permitted to go forward with space projects of a definitely military character.

It is strange that the United States today is prepared to defend itself on land, on and under the sea, and in the air—but not in space.

We seem to be living in a dream world wherein aggressors may attack us on land,

sea, or air, but where space is reserved for peaceful exploration.

The belief in such a dream world is, of course, poppycock. Our leaders refuse to accept the Russians' word in matters of disarmament on earth—they insist on inspection. Yet they placidly operate as though the Russians won't arm in space—an area in which they have never denied they were arming.

The DOD reluctance to go forward with a real space program is a deadly serious matter. We hope that when the Armed Services Committees hold their posture hearings and the Appropriations Committees consider space funds they will make clear to DOD leaders their determination that we shall be militarily prepared in space.

Indignation and Disgust for Many of Our Shortcomings**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent of mine is of interest because it shows the indignation and disgust that many patriotic people feel for many of our shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, we had better pay heed to these rumblings before representative government perishes from the earth:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Some questions one irate citizen would like answered.

WHY

If a big business leader (Blough) raises the price of his product—a move dictated by the economics of the situation—does the President of the United States publicly denounce him and bring intense pressure on his company (United States Steel) to rescind the price raise? But when a pipsqueak labor leader, drunk with his own powers, calls an unwarranted strike against the press of the Nation's greatest city, and cripples the economy of the city, why do not the politicians and Government agencies denounce that labor leader and his union? And why not compulsory arbitration for all labor disputes?

Do we pour American blood and American wealth into some southeast Asian swamp-land to fight communism when, according to our own Army officers, the natives of that land refuse to fight at all?

And why don't we stop subsidizing Mr. Nasser who uses our money to subsidize his own private revolutions and denounces us to the bargain?

Most sincerely,

MAX ERNEST HECHT.

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Of course, you may insert my irate letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That day when an American becomes timorous of criticizing his Chief Executive that will be the day when that American will inadvertently be putting out the "welcome"

mat for a Communist commissar or a Nazi gauleiter.

Incidentally, I may add that at times I disagree with some of your views, but I do respect your integrity and the dignity with which you justify them, and without any of the moralistic claptrap as is the wont of some of your colleagues.

Thank you.

Most sincerely yours,

MAX ERNEST HECHT.

The Best Youth Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members of this House the following editorial of Sunday, February 17, 1963, from the Joplin (Mo.) Globe written by Mr. Rex Newman, an expert observer of the American scene and a former Washington reporter.

Mr. Newman's editorial reflects the feelings of the midwest district which I represent here. It condemns the planned Federal service corps for youth and points out that we can best serve our youth by arranging to leave them less debt and less bureaucracy. And it notes that the home, church, school, YMCA, and Boy and Girl Scouts already have demonstrated their ability to develop American youth:

THE BEST YOUTH CORPS

President Kennedy has sent to Congress another scatter-shot message aimed at further enfolding the youth of the land into our giant and still growing complex of paternalistic bureaucracy. We think the parents of America, through Congress, should reject it.

A much better way to give our youth a better chance would be to start dismantling some of this costly, tax-eating bureaucracy so as to leave them a heritage of less debt and greater unincumbered opportunity.

To teach the youth of the Nation dependence upon Government rather than to encourage individual enterprise is morally wrong, economically unhealthy and nationally weakening. Moreover, the need for it is a theoretical myth.

To undertake to regiment American youths under Youth Conservation Corps, Home-town Corps, Domestic Peace Corps, and whatever else the dreamy minds of bureaucratic do-gooders may conjure up is to confess failure of individual opportunity under free enterprise.

This we categorically dispute. This Nation still abounds in limitless opportunity. Government today, sadly enough, does more to hinder than to encourage it. Nevertheless, we submit that any youth sound of mind and body can with determination, perseverance and encouragement in the home and the local community find his niche in gainful employment. He doesn't need Federal indoctrination in the false political theory of subsidized security.

Indeed, instead of Federal corps of various and sundry labels, the best "corps" we can think of as a solid foundation for youth training still are the home, the school, the church, and the established local youth groups such as the YMCA and the Boy Scouts.

Let's show confidence in our youths by giving them a chance to demonstrate their own self-reliance.

The Refugees—And Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, legitimate words of wisdom and sound observations rarely grow old and it is with this thought in mind that I insert into the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of Friday, January 4, dealing with the Siberian refugees who were ejected from the American Embassy in Moscow.

That incident is certainly a blot on the ability and integrity of the American personnel at the Embassy in Moscow but more importantly at the moment, the method of handling this incident is still before us, since it is consistent with the administration policy of managed news. For this reason, I have inserted this editorial into the RECORD, feeling it is important in its emphasis on the latter point as well as on the original incident:

THE REFUGEES—AND MANAGED NEWS

The case of the 32 Siberian peasants who traveled 2,000 miles to take refuge in the American Embassy in Moscow and who were turned over to the Russians almost immediately is a tragic tale.

The right of political asylum in an embassy does not exist anywhere except in Latin America, according to experts in international law. No embassy in Europe or the United States has any legal right to harbor anyone. (The case of Cardinal Mindszenty is a historic exception.) The American Embassy was acting in accordance with international law in turning the refugees over to their own government—as the Russian Embassy in Washington would have to act if Americans tried to take refuge there. To refuse to release them would be a violation of international law.

While the officials of the American Embassy in Moscow acted in accordance with the dictates of international law in turning the Siberian peasants back to their own government, there is no excuse for the actions these same embassy officials took to manage the news of the event.

The Embassy officials first barred American newsmen from the Embassy. Then a wooden barrier was erected by the American Embassy so the refugees could be transferred from the embassy building into a Russian bus without being seen. Russian policemen on U.S. Embassy grounds threatened American newsmen with confiscation of their cameras if they dared to take pictures of the refugees.

The attitude of the American Embassy officials in this instance seemed to be pro-Russian instead of pro-American. They seemed more interested in cooperating with the Russians than in letting America know what was happening.

This is not an inconsistent attitude of late. More and more we seem to be arriving at a situation where the Government of the United States—and its lesser officials—inlet on managing the news as they see fit. An NBC reporter in Berlin charges U.S. officials with censoring the news and intimidating American reporters. This is a serious charge and merits a serious answer.

The State Department's reply to this charge is merely arrogant. A spokesman for the State Department said: "The policy of U.S. officials in Bonn, Berlin, and Washington is to provide information to

the press and public as speedily and forthrightly as the U.S. and allied interests allow."

Certainly it is time to remind these officials that there is in existence a document known as the Constitution of the United States. There is a first amendment to this Constitution that reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress or grievances."

This means that the people have the right to know what is going on. That right must be honored.

The Candy Twins: LaVona and LaVelda Rowe of Iowa City, Iowa, Please Capital's Sweet Tooth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to tell my colleagues about the Candy Twins, two constituents and longtime friends of mine who visited the Nation's Capital recently. They are Misses LaVona and LaVelda Rowe, identical twins born and raised in Iowa City, Iowa.

The lovely Rowe sisters, who were my guests here in Washington several years ago, are representing the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute on a 6-month tour of the United States. They have already visited some 30 cities from San Antonio to Boston. Being somewhat familiar with always-on-the-go political campaigns, I sympathize with and congratulate the girls for the useful work they are doing.

To give you some idea of the tour, I would like to point out a few of the things the Candy Twins did in Washington when they were here. They visited such places as Junior Village, the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club, homes for the aged, children's, veterans' and general hospitals—and dispensed candy everywhere they went. Valentine candy was presented at the White House to the First Family.

LaVona and LaVelda also appeared on radio and television interviews to discuss questions concerning candy and health. They pointed out the growing popularity of the "candy break" for plant and office workers, and the recognition of candy's quick-energy value by athletic coaches, medical authorities and military leaders. Candy's ability to promote alertness has been recognized by the National Safety Council as a safety factor in preventing highway fatigue. Incidentally, exhaustive research is currently being conducted on this question by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineering, Los Angeles, under a grant from the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute.

The twins discussed how candy can be utilized in a weight-control plan, noting

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A961

payments to the commercial companies since the program got underway. This is a sizable amount of business, a volume that should win you praise and appreciation as a valued customer.

The answers to problems of territorial recognition must be solved by the respective States. Such territorial integrity for rural electric systems has been achieved in a number of States as they have won recognition for the justice of their cause.

Low wholesale power rates and the continued right to serve their territories provide a workable base for rural electric systems in working toward full economic development of their areas.

I am pleased with reports of the effective program being developed by rural electric systems in North Carolina. While many of you are just getting underway in this work, those of you who have been active have contributed to statewide successes that are impressive. Directors, managers, and employees are active both in local and area developmental councils. Some have served on State committees.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT MEANS JOBS

Projects already completed through local effort, as reported to us in a survey of borrowers, have provided almost 2,000 additional jobs in your service areas in the 18-month period. Many of you have improved local community services—often a necessary first step to developing business and industrial potential. Many of these completed projects are agriculturally oriented, which is all to the good. These include, among others, feed mills, egg, strawberry, and poultry processing plants. Other projects center around local recreational development, a highly logical activity in almost every part of North Carolina. You have developed textile, plastic, toy, hosiery, metal stamping companies, and a number of others. For your individual and cooperative contributions to these developments, I congratulate you.

Here in North Carolina you are part of a broadening drive by rural electric cooperatives throughout the Nation to dig in and exercise sustaining leadership in this field. The REA survey of results of the first 18 months is not the proof of the pudding; but a taste of what can be done. We know this must be just the start.

In March 1961 Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman began directing the forces of the Department, including REA, toward improving the income of family farms and to the creation of nonfarm income in rural areas. Through the new Office of Rural Area Development, the various activities of the Department in the field of development are being coordinated toward the basic objectives of the program.

In REA we have a small but expert staff assigned to rural area development work to assist our electric and telephone borrowers requesting help both in the fields of technical assistance and credit finding assistance. In addition, REA has a special financing tool within its own authority that offers limited but important help.

SECTION 5 DESIGNED TO HELP LOCAL AREAS

When the Rural Electrification Act was written in 1936, Congress recognized that it would be shortsighted to build electric facilities if they should not be used because consumers could not pay for the wiring, appliances, and equipment needed to put electricity to work. Under section 5 of the act, REA can make loans to its electric borrowers for relending to their consumers for these purposes.

While the volume of section 5 loans has been small over the years, the loan program has attracted wiring contractors, appliance makers, water system manufacturers, and many others to the rural market. Experience has shown that once tested under section

5 financing, the industry usually takes the initiative to follow up with service, including private financing. The availability of section 5 loans to promote business and industrial projects is similarly proving to be an important asset in stimulating leadership of the rural electric systems in rural area development.

The evidence is mounting that once a project gets underway it can attract substantial local and other private capital to make it successful. REA section-5 loans, and loans through the various Federal lending agencies, are proving to be seed money in stimulating private investment.

In only 14 instances has REA approved section 5 loans for industrial and commercial development for an aggregate amount of \$1,240,000. These are the cases where no other sources are available, and the financing of electric machinery or equipment provides the important last link in the chain of financing.

LEADS TO LARGE LOCAL PARTICIPATION

Recently REA surveyed its electric and telephone borrowers to determine the projects which they have successfully assisted either in the construction or operation state between July 1, 1961, and yearend 1962. The first 600 borrowers to report indicated that they have assisted 402 industrial and commercial type rural development projects with a total investment of about \$300 million. These projects will provide direct employment to about 30,000 persons in these areas. Experience indicates that another 22,000 related jobs would result indirectly from added direct employment. Only about one-fifth of 1 percent of the total capital required in these projects came from REA. Five-sixths of the total capital came from non-Federal sources: A projection of these figures over all 1,795 borrowers would give even higher project, job, and private investments totals. In addition to the commercial and industrial projects, these 600 REA borrowers reported they have helped communities in their areas launch 187 public facility projects such as hospitals, water systems and sewerage systems.

The findings of this survey are a substantial indication that REA borrowers are proving a valuable asset—not just a rural reserve force, but front rank battlers to improve conditions in rural America.

It is good for America that you are there. It is good for North Carolina to keep you there.

Reba
Which Hand Has the M and M's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Farmington (Ill.) Bugle.

This weekly newspaper is published and edited by two young men, Howard Fields and Lowell Rinker. Citizens of Fulton County are proud of these fine youthful Americans and appreciate the contributions they are making toward a better community and a better America.

I am sure many of us agree with the thoughts expressed in this editorial:

WHICH HAND HAS THE M AND M'S?

There is much speculation going on about now on the issue of whether there is another buildup of arms underway in Cuba.

We confess we do not know any more about the situation than Senator KEATING or Secretary of Defense McNamara.

We do believe, however, that any thought or opinion of the situation must take into consideration two episodes out of very recent history.

No. 1 is that just prior to the so-called Cuban crisis last fall, when similar accusations were made, President Kennedy and his administration denied that there was a military buildup of arms in Cuba. That denial turned out to be false and action belated.

No. 2 is the fact that shortly after the crisis had ebbed, the administration admitted to manipulation of the press releases during the crisis to veil the seriousness of the situation. The situation was so serious, in fact, that the United States had actually considered a nuclear attack on the missile bases being erected at that time in Cuba.

We are not the only ones who remember the two cited incidents and we are not the only ones who do not trust the news releases emanating from the White House today.

So, what is the real situation in Cuba? Who knows. The Federal Government is the only one in the position to know all the facts, but it cannot be trusted at this point to let us, the people it serves, know what is going on.

Patronage at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of February 21, 1963:

PATRONAGE AT A PRICE

("The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women," 1960 Democratic platform.)

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political-boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of super employment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student

trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

Learn About the FHA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the following article from the February 1963, issue of the Gulf Coast Lumberman, to the attention of my colleagues. It describes the background and wonderful work of a dedicated public servant, Mr. Neal Pickett, of Houston, Tex. The article, "FHA District Director Neal Pickett's Advice to Lumbermen: 'Learn About the FHA,'" follows:

FHA DISTRICT DIRECTOR NEAL PICKETT'S ADVICE TO LUMBERMEN: LEARN ABOUT THE FHA

The year was 1935—hot, dusty, depression year. A year of the New Deal and Will Rogers. A year of economic crisis for our country.

In Texas, a young man was starting his first year as executive vice president of the Lumbermen's Association of Texas—oldest and largest trade association in the State.

One of his first tasks was to help sell a new Government program to the retail lumber dealers across the State. The program was a new mortgage insurance plan evolved by a recently established Government agency—the Federal Housing Administration. The young LAT executive and a representative from the Washington office of the FHA traveled across the entire State explaining the new program to lumber dealers.

Today, the former LAT executive is director of the Houston district of FHA—and he says his early experiences with lumbermen have proved invaluable in his current job.

His name is C. A. "Neal" Pickett, a hard-hitting dynamo who keeps his office running like a perfectly tuned business machine.

After you've talked about the FHA with Neal Pickett, you know he's a man who likes his job. More important, you know he's sold on what the FHA does to spur progress. And you're a bit pleased at his appreciation and understanding of the importance of profits—essential to the success of almost any undertaking.

Pickett expresses his philosophy this way: "Our fellow citizens are entitled to decent, livable homes at a cost they can pay—and the businessmen who bring a family together with a home of their choice are just as strongly entitled to a fair profit for their efforts."

Neal Pickett went on to become mayor of Houston after leaving his job as executive vice president of the LAT in 1941. People are still taking political potshots at him, but he brushes them aside and keeps moving forward. As a former officeholder himself, and as a brother-in-law of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH (Mrs. Pickett is Senator YARBOROUGH's sister), Neal Pickett knows what it means to have disgruntled politicians sniping at him.

"It's all part of the game," he says, "and

the tributes a Government worker receives more than offsets the occasional political bricks hurled in his direction."

The tributes have been coming fast and frequent since Pickett was named district FHA director in July 1961.

Most of the testimonials point out the increased speed and efficiency of the Houston office since Pickett took over. Here's an example, from an executive in the South's largest mortgage company:

"In the past 2 weeks, I have submitted two cases to FHA for loan approval. Both cases were approved 3 days later."

"This very fine service undoubtedly reflects a competent and efficient organization."

"I would personally like to thank you and your organization for such fine service. It is not only a service to our firm, but also those we serve. Thank you again for your time and cooperation."

Pickett himself is happier about the speed with which his office handles loan requests than any other single accomplishment.

"The processing has been reduced from 7 or 8 weeks to 7 or 8 days," Pickett says. "This alone saves taxpayers a lot of money. One of the main reasons for speed in this office is the fine cooperation we get from Housing and Home Finance Agency offices in other cities."

The Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—the parent agency of FHA—was in Houston last month. Dr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the HHFA, gave the feature address at the annual banquet of the Houston Negro Chamber of Commerce.

At the conclusion of his address, Dr. Weaver (holder of a Ph. D. from Harvard) said:

"No group in these United States can prosper for long unless we all prosper."

"Thus, as the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, I am a servant of all the people of the United States. My concerns are a healthy expanding home-building industry, renewal and revitalization of our urban areas, better and more adequate community facilities for all parts of the Nation, and greater choices in shelter for all Americans."

"A nation as great as ours deserves no less. We are fortunate in that our dreams of comfort can come true. Let us work together for their realization."

In a press conference prior to his address, Dr. Weaver also made these observations:

Regarding the recent Executive order of the President on withholding Government-insured loans when there is racial or religious discrimination—"There has been a great deal of vocal opposition, but so far there have been no adverse effects whatever from this Executive order."

Regarding the urban renewal program—"This program will be accelerated considerably in the next few years. We now have some successful projects under our belt, and the potential of the program is now being fully realized. We are over the hump in urban renewal. It's been shown that this program can and will work."

About Houston's rate of growth: "Houston is a city which one of these days probably will make Los Angeles feel second class."

About homes for the elderly: "The volume of homes for our senior citizens has quadrupled because of loan insurance through the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Concerning the future of Government-insured loans: "Ordinary or conventional type of construction will level off in 1967, so we need to beef up for more Government-insured housing of all types."

What does all this mean to lumbermen in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, and New Mexico?

It means lumbermen should become thoroughly familiar with the FHA program.

Neal Pickett says: "The importance of the retail lumber dealer and the lumber manufacturer familiarizing himself with the vari-

ous FHA fact sheets and other documents cannot be overemphasized. A visit to the nearest office of the FHA could well be one of the best investments in time that a lumberman could make."

Pickett is particularly enthusiastic about the future of the new home remodeling program—203-K—and housing for the elderly.

"The expected tax cut will have a good effect because it will put money into the pockets of people who will more than likely use a lot of the money for new housing or remodeling," Pickett says.

Another of Pickett's favorites is the FHA low-cost housing for small towns and outlying areas, section 203-1 of the National Housing Act.

"One of the most gratifying things about the FHA is that a man used to be about 32 years old before he could even think about buying a home," Pickett explains. "Now, with Government-insured loans, people of 21 can get married one month and buy a home the next."

The year 1962 was the third best year in history in the amount of FHA-insured loans in the 37 east Texas counties covered by Pickett's office. Some 5,206 loans were insured on single housing units for a total of \$63,789,000. This compares with 1961 when 4,427 units were insured for \$53,359,000. In addition, Pickett's district office did about \$8 million worth of other projects in 1962—apartments, nursing homes, housing for the elderly.

Perhaps one reason why Pickett's office is so efficient is because the bulk of his job involves administration, and Pickett has been an administrator most of his life. A native of Houston, he was raised in Brazoria, Tex., and finished high school in Beaumont. After attending the University of Texas from 1922 to 1926, he was named manager of the Mount Pleasant, Tex., Chamber of Commerce. In 1930, he started work as manager of the Insurance Exchange of Houston, then became LAT executive vice president.

After 6 years with the LAT, he was elected mayor of Houston, serving 2 years in this tough, responsible job. In 1943, he joined the American Red Cross and served in military welfare posts in the European theater. He received awards from the Governments of Belgium, Holland, and the United States as a result of his war efforts.

From 1945 until July 1961, when he was named district director of the FHA, Pickett obtained more experience in the mortgage business, serving as vice president of Realty Mortgage Corp in Houston.

In all his background and experience, Pickett treasures his association with lumbermen more than any other. And he would like to see lumbermen everywhere realize full benefit from the FHA.

A trip to your nearest FHA office could be one of the most rewarding visits of your life.

Foreign Polls Squelched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Island Argus of February 22, 1963:

FOREIGN POLLS SQUELCHED

President Kennedy has left himself open to some sharp criticism by suppressing for-

1963

Whether detergents are or are not harmful in drinking water is still unknown. There is no proof that they are, but nobody is keen on drinking detergents, and they are building up in our water supply at a rate of 5 percent increase a year. It is certainly desirable to call a halt to this process at some point and Representative Reuss' way sounds to us like a good one.

Experience of Private Enterprise Versus Centralized Planning: Let's Take the Hint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev seeks solutions to his problems by turning away from centralized planning while we are asked to adopt centralized planning.

The experience of Khrushchev with centralized planning only indicates that experience is the best teacher unless you are of the Kennedy "more-clever-than-thou" school.

"Let's Take the Hint," says the Chicago Tribune:

LET'S TAKE THE HINT

Plagued by the problem of how to get the Russian economy moving, Mr. Khrushchev has taken a few more important steps toward capitalism and free enterprise. The program under which farmers have been freed from central planning and control, and permitted to earn a few rubles on their own, is being extended to industry.

Under a plan drawn up by a Ukrainian economist, Y. G. Liberman, factory managers are to have more independence in running their plants, and those whose plants earn a profit will be entitled to part of it as a personal bonus.

Here is added proof that the Kremlin's boasts about industrial growth, frequently quoted in Mr. Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency, are misleading if not false. Under centralized planning, Russia's economy has proved unable to adjust to the country's needs, and Khrushchev knows it. When a plant manager's only goal is to meet quotas and requirements set in Moscow, he will do it by any means he can. He will produce shoddy goods and goods which nobody wants. It isn't his worry if they pile up unsold.

In Liberman's words, "what is profitable for society must be profitable for each enterprise"—a view which is startlingly reminiscent of capitalistic statements such as "what's good for General Motors is good for the country." Central planning can be reduced to a minimum, according to Liberman, without violating true Socialist principles. Had he dared talk this way a few years ago, Professor Liberman would long since have taken up residence in Siberia.

It's pleasant, of course, to watch Mr. Khrushchev try to lubricate his sticky and overmanaged machine with injections of free enterprise. But let's not forget that for every frantic step he takes away from centralized planning, we are being asked to take another step toward it. Almost every new program offered by the Kennedy administration calls for the intrusion of Federal authority into some new area of our life. And

this can be done, we're told, without violating the principles of free enterprise.

The parallel is too close to overlook. Let's take the hint. When you're heading for a lunchroom and see a fellow rushing out of it in acute gastric distress, it is advisable to think twice before going in.

The Salvation of the Softwood Lumber Industry: Increased Manufacturing and Marketing Efficiency

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the February 17, 1963, issue of a very fine newspaper published in my congressional district, the Eugene Register-Guard. The opinions in this editorial, which just came into my hands, are almost identical to those I expressed last Thursday on the floor during the discussion by a number of members of the softwood lumber industry and the recent Tariff Commission decision. I am gratified that this influential paper has chosen to take such a sensible stand. I hope that the industry itself will adopt and promote this point of view, and that the Federal Government will continue to do whatever it can to assist the industry in meeting the Canadian competition.

The editorial follows:

TO MAKE THE MOST OF A BAD SITUATION

With United States-Canadian relations already strained, it comes as no surprise that the Tariff Commission has turned down ideas that imports of Canadian softwood lumber be artificially restricted.

Even were Washington and Ottawa getting along better, it would be difficult to justify either tariff boosts or import quotas on lumber entering this country from Canada. The United States, as the world's great champion of less restricted international trade, would be hard-pressed to explain why Canadian lumber imports should be curbed at the same time U.S. representatives are beginning a momentous battle to breach trade, would be hard pressed to explain why Market area, and elsewhere.

The economic interest of the Pacific Northwest and other U.S. lumber-producing regions would be served if Canadian lumber imports were cut back. But the national interest would suffer.

Accordingly, representatives of the U.S. lumber industry should now quit chasing rainbows which have no pots of gold at the end of them. Instead, they should concentrate efforts upon attainable objectives of realistic benefit to their industry. Coastal mills which ship by water routes could be further benefited by additional amendments to or complete repeal of the Jones Act which, in effect, forces U.S. lumber producers to help subsidize this Nation's merchant marine. Some inland mills, particularly smaller ones, might be assisted by renewed efforts to restore delay-in-transit privileges they formerly had when making rail adjustments of their wares. A case, at least, can be made for restoration of these privileges—on the basis that they continue to be enjoyed by shippers of many

other commodities and industrial products.

And, of course, there remain a number of lumber industry complaints to be argued further in regard to U.S. Forest Service marketing policies and procedures. One example: In view of the multipurpose public forests management principle, it is reasonable to think that purchasers of public timber should be assisted with more public funds when they build access roads which, at the Government's insistence, must be suitable for recreation travel as well as log trucking.

The Tariff Commission opined that the main reason for the marketing disadvantage at which U.S. lumbermen find themselves is the relatively high cost of stumpage in this country. This situation may be improved, temporarily, as Federal agencies hasten the marketing of tremendous amounts of Pacific Northwest timber felled in last October's hurricane. But it is long-range solutions which the lumber industry needs for stability. And, in spite of all efforts to find such solutions, it remains probable that U.S. mills will be plagued by Canadian competition throughout the foreseeable future. More mills in this country may be forced out of business; more U.S. lumber industry capital may be shifted into British Columbia where cheap logs are abundant.

Wherever it is being unjustly hampered by Government policies, this country's lumber industry has good reason to complain and to fight for better treatment. In addition to this, however, the industry—and communities dependent upon it—must recognize that increased manufacturing and marketing efficiency offers the best hope that Canadian competition can be met. The salvation of the U.S. lumber industry, as presently constituted, depends largely upon offsetting, and not upon attempts to nullify, advantages which inherently belong to Canada.

House Joint Resolution 279: National Harmony Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution (H.J. Res. 279) to designate the 6-day period, beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week. Further, the resolution would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In offering this resolution, I wish to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. This nonprofit, fraternal organization is dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Its more than 650 chapters in all 50 States and most of the Provinces of Canada comprise over 30,000 members.

I am proud to note that this year's international president of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of

Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., S. Wayne Floor, is a resident of my home community of Rochester, N.Y. and a constituent of the district I am privileged to represent in Congress. I hope my colleagues will give favorable consideration to the resolution.

Cuba
What Unseen Hands Direct a United States Policy Which Continues To Give Victories to Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before it is too late and our beloved country is completely destroyed through the machinations of behind-the-scenes planners in the State Department, I implore Congress to get on with the business of a thorough investigation of the Department of State, its policies and its personnel. What dire consequences await this Republic if we fail to root out the planners who are not planning in the self-interest of the United States may be seen in the following article written by Dr. Robert Morris:

HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

(By Robert Morris)

A very discerning friend of mine was recently cataloging the vivid contrasts between the brave declarations of intention of the Presidents of the United States and other official spokesmen and the rather abject actions that have proven to be our actual accomplishments over the last decade.

When the current President first took office 2 years ago he stated that we could not tolerate a Soviet satellite at our doorstep. Not only have we tolerated it but we have watched it grow to a monstrosity many times its size then.

Secretaries of State and gala supporting casts met with leaders of the OAS at Rio de Janeiro, at Caracas, at Punta del Este and at other capitals of Latin America since 1947 and solemnly pledged not to allow communism to set foot on Western Hemisphere soil. These treaties are a mockery now—flouted and defied—and instead of enforcing them we change the patent meaning of the firm resolutions to a sickly resolve to confine the foothold to Cuba.

Our Secretary of Defense declares that we have no proof that Castro is exporting his revolution to other Latin American countries but his words trail off into an announcement of Castro agents pirating a Venezuelan ship and sabotaging industrial installations in that target country.

Our Secretary of State tells us that communism in the hemisphere is not negotiable and we precede to negotiate with Mikoyan and other bloody Soviet murderers over Cuba.

We insist that our belated quarantine around Cuba would be lifted only after "on-site inspection." The quarantine was lifted without such inspection.

We reject, with a flourish, Khrushchev's demand that we dismantle our Turkish missile bases. We then proceed not only to announce the dismantling of these very bases in Turkey but in Italy as well and then, as if for good measure, declare we will pull

out our nuclear bombers in the next 16 months and withdraw support troops from Europe.

These and other agonizing contrasts have become a hallmark of American policy. They are painfully dismissed as inconsistencies.

What should be pointed out is that President Kennedy, I am sure, was sincere when he made that buoyant observation that a Soviet satellite should not prevail at our doorsteps. It was his policy planners who did not share his high resolve. What inconsistency there is—and it is great—lies not in the different acts of the elected officials but rather in the contrast of outlook between these officials and the policy planners.

The policy planners have an underlying program, all worked out, for a merger of the United States with our Soviet enemy whom these planners do not acknowledge to be an enemy. These planners will never accept a plan or resolve to eliminate Soviet power unless it moves at an aggressive rate, more accelerated than that called for by some still mysterious slide rule of theirs. When this happens they temporarily leave their drawingboards but resume their stance as soon as the misunderstanding is corrected.

As I write this, the Congress is storming at the U.N. grant of \$3 million in agricultural aid to Castro. The leaders of the executive branch are wringing their hands because it is politically embarrassing but the planners are silent. They know it is policy and are waiting until the storm abates to carry on.

This precise situation occurred in 1957 after the Hungarian explosion. The gambit used then was identical. While our elected leaders were still livid denouncing the savagery of Khrushchev and Mikoyan for slaughtering the Hungarians, the FAO, a specialized agency of the U.N. quietly slipped through a farm grant to dictator Kadar in about the same amount that the American Paul G. Hoffman is slipping through to Castro. Our State Department then as now said they could do nothing about it, it was the U.N. and not the United States acting.

I was with a Senate committee then and we tried to learn who was engineering the seemingly inconsistent act of granting aid to the Soviets in Hungary at the very time official Washington was denouncing them. It was, I suspected then, a guideline being hoisted lest some of the wavering planners accept the flamboyant statements of the elected leaders against communism as a change of policy.

Of course that proved to be the case. Kadar, like Gomulka, Tito, and Sukarno before him, received the FAO grant and others followed. The Hungarian inquiry is now even off the U.N. agenda and the distinction, fabricated at times of emergency to silence the clamor, of no U.S. funds being expressly allocated to a particular grant is no longer necessary there. Hungary is back in the groove.

One of the best gages of our policy toward Cuba will be found in the assignment of personnel who have taken a stand on Castro. Ambassadors Robert C. Hill, Arthur Gardner, Earl Smith, Whiting Willauer, and Policy Planner Ray Leddy all took a firm stand against Castro, while the State Department was favoring his ascent to power. The first three are retired from service. Willauer, a brilliant and courageous diplomat, has been dismissed and died recently of a broken heart. Ray Leddy is at the Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania. On the other hand William Welland and Ambassador Philip Bonsal and others who opposed these people are in the midst of planning in official Washington.

Like the FAO grant in 1957, this personnel design is the true guideline to policy. The

discerning will recognize it. The Senators and the Congressmen in Washington should know that Paul G. Hoffman's grant to Castro will be the guideline too, to our policy toward Cuba unless they demand the shakeup in the policy agencies that is so long overdue. Paul G. Hoffman, I am sure, is not persona non grata among the planners. He has been their friend.

Financial Shambles Being Created in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following joint statement of the New York State Democratic legislative leaders Senator Joseph Zaretzki and Assemblyman Anthony J. Travia.

This statement, dated February 15, demonstrates the methods being used in Albany to create a mythical pay-as-you-go image.

The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH ZARETZKI AND ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY J. TRAVIA, DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

The new system devised by Governor Rockefeller to finance State university construction in 1963-64 and beyond is another reflection of his fiscal juggling concerning his increased deficit financing budget operations.

This subterfuge may cost the taxpayers of the State as much as \$800 million more for State university buildings that will be erected during the next 10 years than it would if construction were financed from the \$250 million higher education bond fund, approved by the voters in 1957.

The Governor has been and continues to be shockingly devious about this highly important plan to change the traditional method of financing State university construction. He is being deliberately devious in order that the public not see through this additional pay-as-you-go sham. This is another of his slick, ball-juggling acts. As reported by the press, the combination involved this time would be the State university income fund, the State university construction fund, and either the State housing finance agency or the State employees retirement system—or both.

If either the housing finance agency or the employees' retirement system are to be the mechanism through which the Governor borrows sufficient money annually to defray State university construction costs, it may well cost the voters 1 percent interest more for the money borrowed than if financing were through the voter-approved higher education bond fund. The reason for this is that bonds issued from the higher education bond fund are backed by the full faith and credit of the State, whereas housing finance agency bonds are not, and a higher rate of interest is ordinarily demanded when the State's credit is not behind bonds issued by State authorities.

Moreover, bonds thus far issued from the higher education bond fund have been for periods of but 15 and 20 years and it is unlikely the State comptroller would permit their issuance for longer periods. However, newspaper reports have indicated the Governor's intention of issuing housing finance